

**Remarks**

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action dated as mailed February 9, 2007 and the documents cited therewith. After the above amendments, the present application contains claims 1-3, 5-15, 17-22, 24-28, 30-35, 37-42, and 44-46. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 17, 20, 21, 24, 26, 30-32, 37, and 40 have been amended. Claims 4, 16, 23, 29, 36, and 43 have been canceled.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-16, 19-23, 25-29, 31-36, 38-43, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Qian et al. (U.S. Pub. No. US 2003/0145275, hereinafter “Qian”) in view of Shahrababaki et al. (U.S. Pub. No.: US 2004/0113948, hereinafter “Shahrababaki”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Turning initially to claim 1, claim 1 has been amended to recited:

“a placeholder formed in the portal environment to represent the detached portal page when detached, wherein the placeholder is formed in response to the portal page being detached...”

Shahrababaki was cited on page 3 of the Office Action in rejecting claim 4 for teaching a placeholder (tab-head) formed in the environment to represent the detached page. Applicant respectfully submits that Shahrababaki does not teach or suggest a placeholder, nor does Qian or Shahrababaki teach or suggest a placeholder formed in the portal environment to represent the detached portal page when detached and wherein the placeholder is formed in response to the portal page being detached as recited in amended claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the placeholder in amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the tab-head in Shahrababaki. In paragraph [0018], last sentence, Shahrababaki recites:

“A tab-strip control presents information in a panel of a window using tabs with tab-heads in a tab-strip border or navigation bar; a visible tab-head can be selected to make a hidden tab appear in the panel.”

Additionally, in paragraph [0024] Shahrababaki recites:

“FIG. 2 shows an example of mult tab-window user interface with detachable tabs. A main window 200 includes multiple panels, one

Amdt. dated May 8, 2007

Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2007

of which provides a tab-strip control. The tab-strip includes a currently visible tab 205 and several hidden tabs with tab-heads shown in a tab-strip border 210, such as a tab-head 215. The tab-heads in the tab-strip border 210 correspond to tabs in the panel of the window 200 such that selecting a tab-head causes the corresponding tab to brought forward, displaying the tab's content in the panel and hiding the previously displayed tab."

As indicated in these recitations from Shahrababaki, the tab-heads are always visible to permit a user to select a tab-head to cause the corresponding tab to be brought forward and displayed in the panel. Accordingly, the tab-heads are part of the tabs and are not placeholders for a detached portal page or a detached tab in Shahrababaki. Additionally, the tab-heads are not formed in response to the tab being detached because the tab-heads must always be presented or displayed for selection to cause the corresponding tab to be brought forward and displayed.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"...wherein the placeholder is substantially smaller than the portal page to permit a plurality of portal pages and at least one portlet contained within each portal page to be presented via their respective placeholders to a user at the same time."

In contrast, Shahrababaki teaches that the tab-heads are shown in a tab-strip border located at the border of the displayed page and are merely used to select the associated tab to cause the tab to be brought forward for displaying in the panel. Thus, the tab-heads of Shahrababaki are not placeholders in the portal environment that permits a plurality of portal pages and at least one portlet contained within each portal page to be presented via their respective placeholders to a user at the same time as recited in amended claim 1. The tab-heads of Shahrababaki only permit the single associated tab to be displayed.

For all of these reasons, amended claim 1 is submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Qian and Shahrababaki, whether considered individually or combined, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2, 3, 6-7 and 9-11, these claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over Qian and Shahrababaki. For example, claim 10 recites:

Amdt. dated May 8, 2007

Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2007

“wherein the detachable portal page comprises:  
at least one detachable portlet; and  
a detach feature associated with the at least one detachable portlet.”

And claim 11 recites: “further comprising a portlet window to receive a detached portlet in response to activating the detach feature.”

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Qian nor Shahrabaki teach or suggest at least one detachable portal page and a detach feature associated with the at least one detachable portal page, as recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 10 and 11 depend, in addition to at least one detachable portlet and a detach feature associated with the at least one detachable portlet, as taught by dependent claim 10, and a portlet window to receive the detached portlet in response to activating the detach feature, as recited in claim 11.

Claims 2-3, 6-7, and 9 also depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and by virtue of that dependency, contain all of the features of independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-3, 6-7, and 9-11 are all submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Qian and Shahrabaki, whether considered individually or combined, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of claims 13-16, 19-23, 25-29, 31-36, 38-43, and 46, independent claims 13, 21, 26, 32, and 40 have been amended to recite similar features to independent claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Qian and Shahrabaki for the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claims 14-15, and 19-20, these claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over Qian and Shahrabaki. For example, claim 20 recites:

“detaching a selected portlet in response to activating a portlet detach feature;  
reattaching the detached portlet in response to activating a portlet reattach feature;  
and

forming a portlet placeholder formed in the detachable portal page to represent the selected portlet when detached, wherein the portlet placeholder is formed in response to the selected portlet being detached.”

Claim 20 also depends from independent claim 13 and thereby includes all of the features of claim 13. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Qian and Shahrabaki of both a detachable portal page and a detachable portlet wherein the portal page and the detachable portlet are each respectively detached or reattached by activating a detach feature or reattach feature. Further, neither Qian nor Shahrabaki teach or suggest forming a placeholder in the portal environment for each detached portal page when detach (claim 13) and forming a portlet placeholder in the detachable portal page to represent the selected portlet when detached as recited in claim 20 and independent claim 13 from which claim 20 depends.

Claims 14-15, and 17-19 also depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 13, and by virtue of that dependency, contain all of the features of independent claim 13. Accordingly, claims 14-15 and 17-20 are submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Qian and Shahrabaki, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of these claims is respectfully solicited.

With respect to the rejection of claims 22, 25, 27, 28, 31, 33-35, 38, 39, 41, 42, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Qian in view of Shahrabaki, claims 22 and 25 depend directly from independent claim 21; claims 27, 28, 30 and 31 depend directly from independent claim 26; claims 33-35, 38, and 39 depend directly from independent claim 32; and claims 41, 42, and 46 depend directly from independent claim 40. Because of these dependencies, these dependent claims include all of the features of the referenced independent claims. Accordingly, these claims are also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Qian and Shahrabaki for the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent claims 21, 26, 32, and 40. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claims 22, 25, 27, 28, 31, 33-35, 38, 39, 41, 42, and 46 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 8, 12, 17-18, 24, 30, 37, and 44-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Qian in view of Shahrabaki and in further view of Becker et al. (U.S. Patent 6,981,223, hereinafter “Becker”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 5 recites: “wherein the placeholder comprises a reattach feature to reattach the detached portal page to the portal environment in response to activating the reattach feature.” The Office Action on page 7 admits that Qian and Shahrabaki fail to teach that the placeholder comprises a reattach feature.

The Office Action cited Becker for teaching a multiple messaging window management system wherein a main window comprises a reattach feature (Figure. 13-Dock Option 1204) to reattach (dock) the detached window pane to the portal in response to activating the reattach features (Figure 13, Column 19, Lines 55-57 of Becker). Becker in Column 19, lines 53-59 recites:

“While the user interface of FIGS. 12 and 13 is similar to the user interface of FIG. 1, there are some differences of note. For example, a toggle switch 1204 marked “DOCK OPTION” is used to alternatively dock and undock all window pane sets. The undocked window pane sets 1304 and 1306 may be repositioned as desired using, for example, mouse controls.”

Accordingly, Becker merely teaches that window pane sets 1304 and 1306 may be separated using the toggle switch 1204 marked “DOCK OPTION” and then repositioned using a mouse. Applicant respectfully submits that Becker does not teach or suggest that a placeholder is formed to take the place of the undocked window pane set. This would be contrary to the teachings of Becker, wherein Becker teaches that the window pane sets can be repositioned using mouse controls. Replacing one of the window panes with a placeholder would defeat this function of Becker. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Becker with Qian and Shahrababaki.

Even if it were proper to combine Qian, Shahrababaki, and Becker, they still would not provide the embodiments of the present invention as recited in the claims. As indicated above, claim 5 recites: “wherein the placeholder comprises a reattach feature to reattach the detached portal page to the portal environment in response to activating the reattach feature.” In contrast, Becker, as just discussed does not teach or suggest that the undocked window pane is formed as a placeholder as provided by the present invention as recited in the claims. Claim 5 also depends directly from independent claim 1, and by virtue of that dependency, contains all of the features of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Becker adds nothing to the teachings of Qian and Shahrababaki so as to render independent claim 1 unpatentable. Therefore, claim 5 is submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Qian, Shahrababaki and Becker, whether considered individually or combined, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claim 5 is respectfully solicited.

Amdt. dated May 8, 2007

Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2007

With respect to the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Qian in view of Shahrababaki and in further view of Becker, claim 8 recites similar features to claim 5. Additionally, claim 8 depends indirectly from independent claim 1, and by virtue of that dependency, contains all of the features of independent claim 1 and all intervening claims. Therefore, claim 8 is also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the cited documents, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claim 8 is respectfully solicited.

Regarding the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Qian in view of Shahrababaki and further in view of Becker, as previously discussed, claim 12 recites:

“a portlet placeholder formed in the detachable portal page to represent the detached portlet when detached, wherein the portlet placeholder is formed in response to the at least one detachable portlet being detached;

a portlet reattach feature associated with the portlet placeholder to reattach the detached portlet to the portal page in response the portlet reattach feature being activated; and

another portlet reattach feature associated with the detached portlet to reattach the detached portlet in response to the other portlet reattach feature being activated.

Additionally, claim 12 depends indirectly from independent claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1 by virtue of this dependency. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Qian, Shahrababaki and Becker of a portal environment that includes at least one detachable portal page, a detach feature, and a placeholder formed in the portal environment to represent the detached portal page, as recited in independent claim 1; in addition to a portlet placeholder formed in the detachable portal page to represent the detached portlet, a portlet reattach feature associated with the portlet placeholder and another portlet reattach feature associated with the detached portlet when detached, as recited in dependent claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over Qian, Shahrababaki and Becker, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claim 17-18, 24, 30, 37, and 44-45, these claims recite similar features to claims 5, 8 and 12. Additionally, claim 17-18 depend either directly or indirectly

from independent claim 13; claim 24 depends directly from independent claim 21; claim 30 depends directly from independent claim 26; claim 37 depends directly from independent claim 32; and claims 44-45 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 40. Because of these dependencies, these dependent claims contain all of the features of the respective referenced independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Becker adds nothing to the teachings of Qian and Shahrabaki so as to render independent claims 13, 21, 26, 32, and 40 unpatentable. Therefore, these claims are submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the cited documents, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of these claims is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions about the present Amendment or anticipates finally rejecting any claim of the present application, a telephone interview is requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick R. Guido et al.  
(Applicant)

Date: May 8, 2007

By: 

Charles L. Moore  
Registration No. 33,742  
Moore & Van Allen, PLLC  
430 Davis Drive  
Suite 500  
Morrisville, N.C. 27560  
Telephone: (919) 286-8000  
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199